The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was <u>not</u> written for publication and is <u>not</u> binding precedent of the Board.

_____

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

_____

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

_____

<u>Ex parte</u> ROBERT MACK

_____

Appeal No. 2002-1767
Application 09/362,530[1]

_____

ON BRIEF

_____

Before BARRETT, GROSS, and BLANKENSHIP, <u>Administrative Patent Judges</u>.

BARRETT, <u>Administrative Patent Judge</u>.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from the final rejection of claims 1-27. In the examiner's answer, pages 16-17, the examiner states that claims 2, 7, 10, and 13 are objected to, although the statements of the rejections have not

_____

[1] Application for patent filed July 28, 1999, entitled "Paired Keys for Data Structures."

- 1 -

been modified. Appellant correctly notes that if claims 2, 7, 10, and 13 are allowable if rewritten, this means that claims 2, 4-8, and 10-14 would be allowable if rewritten. Thus, the appeal is limited to claims 1, 3, 9, and 15-27.

We reverse.

BACKGROUND

The invention relates to computer database records. Appellant's invention is providing paired keys in two fields of a data record. The keys initially contain the same identification, where the identification uniquely identifies the record (i.e., the identification is a primary key). Thereafter, one of the keys may be changed to implement various functions (see specification, p. 3). For example, in Fig. 14A, the "Business Party ID" and the "Original Business Party ID" are two fields of a record which initially contain the same identification. If one of the records is found to be a duplicate (as shown, "Joe Green" is the same as "Joseph Green"), the "Business Party ID" for one is changed to the "Business Party ID" of the other and the "Status" is changed from "Active" to "Duplicate." In this way, a history of the change is retained and, if necessary, the change can be reversed.

Claim 1 is reproduced below.

1. A computer-implemented method comprising the steps of

creating a first field for a first reference data record and placing a first identification in the first field of the first reference data record;

creating a second field for a first reference data record and placing the first identification in the second field of the first reference data record; and

wherein the first identification uniquely identifies the first reference data record.

The examiner relies on the following references:

Vijaykumar   5,745,896   April 28, 1998
Beauchesne   6,128,626   October 3, 2000
                                        (filed June 30, 1998)

The statements of the rejections are modified to reflect the examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 3, 15-17, 23, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Beauchesne.

Claims 9, 18-22, and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauchesne and Vijaykumar.

We refer to the final rejection (Paper No. 4) and the examiner's answer (Paper No. 11) (pages referred to as "EA__") for a statement of the examiner's rejection, and to the brief (Paper No. 10) (pages referred to as "Br__") and reply brief (Paper No. 12) (pages referred to as "RBr__") for a statement of appellant's arguments thereagainst.

OPINION

Appellant notes that "[t]he examiner calls the 'file key' of Beauchese [sic] a 'first identification'" (Br9). We agree with this interpretation of the examiner's rejection because the examiner relies on column 3, lines 51-60, for the "first field" with a "first identification" (EA3). Appellant argues that the "file key" of Beauchesne: (1) does not uniquely identify a reference data record; and (2) the identification under the "file key" of Beauchesne is not placed in two fields of a single data record (Br9-10; Br11). Appellant also argues that to the extent the examiner relies on Beauchesne's "pair of key values" in the advisory action, the pair of key values refers to "ON" and "OFF" fields which: (1) do not have the same value; and (2) do not uniquely identify a data record or a table entry (Br11). We are in full agreement with these arguments. Thus, we are puzzled why the examiner has maintained the rejection. We look to the examiner's response to the arguments in the examiner's answer.

The examiner states that "appellants [sic] are interpreting the claims very narrow[ly] without considering the broad teachings of the references used in the rejection" (EA18). The examiner discusses the teachings of Beauchesne (at EA18-19), but fails to explain where it teaches a "first identification" stored in first and second fields of a first reference data record,

- 4 -

where the "first identification uniquely identifies the first

reference data record." The examiner states (EA18):

> Beauchesne has shown (col. 2, lines 10-65, product table)
> that each index entry has a reference key and a component
> key wherein each of them uniquely identifying [sic,
> identifies] the record. It is important to note that
> claim 1 does not require that the first and second field be
> on the same record ("field <u>for</u> a first reference record").

The reference key and the component key described at

column 2 clearly do not contain the same identification, so we do

not know what point the examiner intends to make. We conclude

that the examiner's interpretation of a "first field for a first

reference data record" and a "second field for a first reference

data record" in claim 1 as not needing to be fields on the same

record is erroneous. Even if the examiner was correct, the

examiner has not shown two fields for the same record having the

same identification. Moreover, the examiner does not deal with

the language of claims 15, 18, and 21. We find no way that

Beauchesne can anticipate claims 1 and 15. Appellant's arguments

in the reply brief (RBr2-3) are also persuasive. Although the

names are similar, the "pair of key values" in Beauchesne

(col. 4, line 9) does not anticipate appellant's "paired keys"

(specification, p. 3, line 9). The anticipation rejection of

claims 1, 3, 15-17, 23, and 27 is reversed.

Vijaykumar does not cure the deficiencies of Beauchesne with

respect to independent claims 1 and 15. Independent claims 18

and 21 contain similar limitations to those in claim 1 and

Vijaykumar does not cure the deficiencies of Beauchesne with

respect to those limitations. Accordingly, the obviousness

rejection of claims 9, 18-22, and 24-26 is reversed.

<div align="center">REVERSED</div>

LEE E. BARRETT	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	BOARD OF PATENT
ANITA PELLMAN GROSS	)	APPEALS
Administrative Patent Judge	)	AND
	)	INTERFERENCES
	)	
	)	
	)	
HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	

Appeal No. 2002-1767
Application 09/362,530

WALTER J. TENCZA, JR.
10 STATION PLACE, SUITE 3
METUCHEN, NJ 08840